

9/30/72

Dear Phil,

Your long silence after my last letter makes me feel I've in some way embarrassed you. No need to feel that way, if you do. You can do only so much and if what I asked can't be done, then it can't be.

Meanwhile, in a fashion I'm learning my way through what is called therapy. At first it was an enormous futility. Our medical coop, which really isn't that any more, has finally done what they should have to begin with, arranged for it locally. Strangely, a member of their staff practises at the local clinic. Rather it is strange because he seems to be entirely uninfluenced by what I've called witchcraft in their records whereas the private clinic in Washington's suburbs seems to have been dominated by them. Only time will tell if this is beneficial. I have no doubt it can be, but I'm not persuaded that after so long a period of neglect it will be enough.

The medical administrator arranged a meeting between him, his new chief of psychiatry and me for Tuesday. It was no more than an occasion for his repetition of what he'd already said and a means of pretending he had an open mind and ear. It is no great disappointment because I'd expected no more. I didn't even get mad when he volunteered what he pretended is a "solution" to the problem of this low-grade sorcery pretended to be medicine, that he would add to the records my belief that the "diagnosis" was wrong. If it would take anything to persuade a strange doctor that the records are correct, that would do it. I correctly anticipated that he would follow this with a self-serving and deceptive letter. He did. I pointed out its deceptiveness and evasiveness in a detailed response, reminded him for the record that the alleged illnesses are dangerous but treatable, that they had never told either of us of the "diagnoses" and had failed to treat (for which we pay), and that if they had any faith in such a business they should justify not informing my wife of the hazard potential to her or what to do for me. My chief concern is that doctors will continue to be influenced by this stuff and that as I can now see, it will color treatment and more.

Also predictably in such cases, the lawyer is doing virtually nothing and that months later. When I prodded him he apologized and said he'd get with it. He has left me no choice but to go off a bit on my own and to a degree the result has been encouraging. People are becoming concerned with such problems, especially some of the young ones I've met in some of the ecology groups recently. There appears to be duplication of what happened to my wife duly recorded in official proceedings held for this purpose. There seems to be reason to hope that some of these groups will see the potential for positive accomplishment in our suit and will be of some help. To date the interest appears genuine. In the first suit for damages from the helicopters we did establish a precedent. Extending it is the possibility. I doubt it will come to pass by legislation for noise is like other pollution, caused by the more powerful or government itself.

Recently I've been more occupied with the preparation of an elaborate habeas corpus petition in the Ray case. I hope that obligation has taken most of the time it will for there is other work to which I long to return. I've heard nothing from N.O. The most recent clippings I've seen leave me a bit uneasy. I know enough of the people involved in that mess, on both sides, to have a hunch there is something not natural about the present. In N.O. you can't follow the game with a scorecard. They change sides too fast. One of many examples, not as typical but perhaps more dramatic: the last time I was there Garrison and others were in court on state charges he contrived, to arrange a double-jeopardy deal or for other purposes not as apparent. And who do you think was spokesman for the many defendants? Garrison's adversary in the Shaw case, Dymond. He also spoke for Garrison. There seems to have been a frequent changeover in counsel. One I know was Garrison's lawyer in one story and the next time I saw his name, he represented Gervais! Fraout, eh? And perhaps least believable of all, the lawyer reputedly farthest to the left in the state (a very decent man, by the way) was selected by the judge to be special prosecutor vice Garrison, who was among those charged.

Hope things are well with you.

Sincerely,

I have written Lorenz, with whom I had earlier correspondence, and after it cools and I may be more sensitive to my multitudinous typos, I will read and correct it. I will enclose a carbon. It may tell you something I may not have. My knowledge of the applicable literature is probably limited, but from that knowledge I'd say he and Selye, in that order, are the greatest. To my limited knowledge, he encompasses much more than Selye. I am as overwhelmed by him and his concepts as I am underwhelmed by the few shrinks I'm met. I found Newman's a remarkably perceptive and sensitive interview. Allowing for editing, which was invisible to me if it existed, it was still a virtuoso performance. Interviewing a man of these staggering concepts is no simple task. If I get a transcript, would you like to read it? Don't feel as though you should. You may not feel of Lorenz as I do. There was an emotional and intellectual magnet for me because he described what to me are exact ~~approx~~ parallels to my observations and beliefs from the lower-animal world. H

Mr. Edwin Newman

RBC News

Rockefeller Center

New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Newman,

Your interview with Konrad Lorenz aired today on "Speaking Freely" is almost as much a tribute to you as it is to him.

To me he is one of the greatest minds. Having in a minor way duplicated some of his earliest work, I am even more impressed with the point to which he has carried it.

That you could draw so much of him in a single interview and without the most elaborate study of all of his work is something for which we are in your debt and of which I think you should be proud.

Neither my wife nor I uttered a single word for the entire hour!

If this interview was transcribed, I would very much appreciate a transcript for myself and one for another. If it has not been, is it possible to get a sound tape?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg